UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,916	11/25/2003	Ranjit S. Narjala	P17490	9801

59796   7590   05/04/2007

INTEL CORPORATION
c/o INTELLEVATE, LLC
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
PATEL, JAY P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/723,916	NARJALA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jay P. Patel	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>1125/2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 November 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the claims filed on 11/25/2003.

2.   Claims 1-24 are pending.

3.   Claims 1-24 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   Claim s 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lee (US Patent 7047561 B1) in view of Inoue et al. (US Patent

.6167513).

In regards to claim 1, Lee shows in figure 5 a packet processing method to using

a firewall in association with real-time Internet applications. After layer 3 and layer 4

processing is carried out at step 515, at step 520 the packet is split into TCP and UDP

data. The process of figure 5 is carried out according to the functions of the network

layers in figure 2, where layers 7 through 3 implement packet filter policy (establishing a

policy manager).

Subsequently in steps 550 and 555, packet filtering is applied (examining the

packet according to at least one filter in the policy manager).

If at step 555, a packet is allowed to pass through, at subsequent steps 560 and

565, TCP and IP headers are respectively added (informing a driver whether to modify

the packet)

In further regards to claim 1, Lee fails to teach, the filtering policies being applied

on a mobile node. Inoue teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 3 where a

mobile IP network is shown with gateways 4a-4c and a mobile node 2. The gateways, carryout filtering according to prescribe security policies for the mobile node (see column 11, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claim 2, Lee shows in steps 565 an IP header added to a packet.

In regards to claim 3, Lee in combinations with Inoue teaches all the limitations of parent claims 1 and 2. Lee fails to show new source and destination addresses being added to an IP header. Inoue however shows in figure 7, an inner IP header being added with a new source and destination addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claims 4 and 5, Lee shows in step 520, the data being split into TCP and UDP data and in steps 550 and 560, UDP packet filtering policy is applied.

In regards to claim 7, Lee shows in figure 5 a packet processing method to using a firewall in association with real-time Internet applications. After layer 3 and layer 4 processing is carried out at step 515, at step 520 the packet is split into TCP and UDP data. The process of figure 5 is carried out according to the functions of the network layers in figure 2, where layers 7 through 3 implement packet filter policy (establishing a policy manager).

Subsequently in steps 550 and 555, packet filtering is applied (examining the packet according to at least one filter in the policy manager).

If at step 555, a packet is allowed to pass through, at subsequent steps 560 and 565, TCP and IP headers are respectively added (informing a driver whether to modify the packet)

In further regards to claim 7, Lee fails to teach, the filtering policies being applied on a mobile node. Inoue teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 3 where a mobile IP network is shown with gateways 4a-4c and a mobile node 2. The gateways, carryout filtering according to prescribe security policies for the mobile node (see column 11, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claim 8, Lee shows in steps 565 an IP header added to a packet.

In regards to claim 9, Lee in combinations with Inoue teaches all the limitations of parent claims 7 and 8. Lee fails to show new source and destination addresses being added to an IP header. Inoue however shows in figure 7, an inner IP header being added with a new source and destination addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claims 10 and 11, Lee shows in step 520, the data being split into TCP and UDP data and in steps 550 and 560, UDP packet filtering policy is applied.

In regards to claim 13, Lee shows in figure 5 a packet processing method to using a firewall in association with real-time Internet applications. After layer 3 and layer 4 processing is carried out at step 515, at step 520 the packet is split into TCP and UDP data. The process of figure 5 is carried out according to the functions of the network layers in figure 2, where layers 7 through 3 implement packet filter policy (a policy manager including at least one filter).

Subsequently in steps 550 and 555, packet filtering is applied. If at step 555, a packet is allowed to pass through, at subsequent steps 560 and 565, TCP and IP headers are respectively added (a driver receiving instructions from policy manger to modify the packet)

In further regards to claim 13, Lee fails to teach, the filtering policies being applied on a mobile node. Inoue teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 3 where a mobile IP network is shown with gateways 4a-4c and a mobile node 2. The gateways, carryout filtering according to prescribe security policies for the mobile node (see column 11, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claim 14, Lee shows in steps 565 an IP header added to a packet.

In regards to claim 15, Lee in combinations with Inoue teaches all the limitations of parent claims 14 and 15. Lee fails to show new source and destination addresses being added to an IP header. Inoue however shows in figure 7, an inner IP header being added with a new source and destination addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claims 16 and 17, Lee shows in step 520, the data being split into TCP and UDP data and in steps 550 and 560, UDP packet filtering policy is applied.

In regards to claim 19, Lee shows in figure 5 a packet processing method to using a firewall in association with real-time Internet applications. After layer 3 and layer 4 processing is carried out at step 515, at step 520 the packet is split into TCP and UDP data. The process of figure 5 is carried out according to the functions of the network layers in figure 2, where layers 7 through 3 implement packet filter policy. Subsequently in steps 550 and 555, packet filtering is applied (accessing at least one filter and examining the packet according to at least one filter in the policy manager).

If at step 555, a packet is allowed to pass through, at subsequent steps 560 and 565, TCP and IP headers are respectively added (modifying the packet according to the filter).

In further regards to claim 19, Lee fails to teach, the filtering policies being applied on a mobile node. Inoue teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 3 where a mobile IP network is shown with gateways 4a-4c and a mobile node 2. The gateways, carryout filtering according to prescribe security policies for the mobile node (see column 11, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claim 20, Lee shows in steps 565 an IP header added to a packet.

In regards to claim 21, Lee in combinations with Inoue teaches all the limitations of parent claims 19 and 20. Lee fails to show new source and destination addresses being added to an IP header. Inoue however shows in figure 7, an inner IP header being added with a new source and destination addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

In regards to claims 22 and 23, Lee shows in step 520, the data being split into TCP and UDP data and in steps 550 and 560, UDP packet filtering policy is applied.

5.   Claims 6, 12, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US Patent 7047561 B1) and Inoue et al. (US Patent 6167513) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 19-23 above, and further in view of Donahue (US Patent 7149219 B2).

In regards to claims 6, 12, 28 and 24, Lee in combination with Inoue teaches all the limitations of parent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Neither Lee nor Inoue teach however, a filtering process determining an original destination IP address for a packet. Donahue teaches the above-mentioned limitation.

Donahue teaches a content filtering server that determines the destination IP address of a packet (see column 4, lines 27-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the examination of the destination address as taught by Donahue with the firewall processing method taught by Lee into a security policy implement by the gateways in the mobile IP network disclosed by Inoue. The motivation to do so would be to provide security for real time applications that use mobile IP.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay P. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3086. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 am - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jpp 4|29|07
Jay P. Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

***

HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600